



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, DC 20231

PS

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/646,503	05/08/96	RIDDLE	G 04860.P1937

LM02/0201

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BLVD
SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES CA 90025

EXAMINER

HO, C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2757

DATE MAILED:

02/01/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/646,503

Applicant(s)

GUY RIDDLE

Examiner

Chuong Ho

Group Art Unit

2757



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Nov 30, 1998

☒ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire Three month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☒ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2757

1. The amendment filed 11/30/98 have been entered and made of record.
2. Applicant's argument filed 11/30/98 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive with regard to claim 1-9 for the following reasons:

As to claim 15, the Applicant argues that the claimed invention is different from the Ludwig (U.S. Patent No. 5,617,539) because *Ludwig does not anticipate the features present in the currently amended claims to use a listen string*. The examiner disagrees, Ludwig teaches to use a listen string "in the case of a data conferencing session, the Collaboration Initiator locates, via the AVNM, the Collaboration Initiator modules at the CMWs of the chosen recipients, and sends a message causing the Collaboration Initiator modules to invoke the Snapshot Sharing modules 164 at each participant's CMW. As indicated previously, additional collaborative services-such as Mail 165, Application Sharing 166, Computer-Integrated Telephony 167 and Computer Integrated Fax 168-are also available from the CMW by utilizing Collaboration Initiator module 161 to initiate the session (i.e., to contact the participants) and to invoke the appropriate application necessary to the collaborative session "

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2757

4. Claims 1-6, 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ludwig (U.S. Patent No. 5,617,539) in view of Mirashrafi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,574,934).

In claim 1, 9, Ludwig teaches in a computer system having a memory, a processor, and a network interface (see figure 18A). Ludwig et al. further teaches a method comprising the steps of: receiving an incoming call signal on network interface (see figure 18A). Ludwig further teaches processing incoming call signal to detect an intended recipient application using a listen string (see col.19, lines 40-55, in the case of a data conferencing session, the Collaboration Initiator locates, via the AVNM, the Collaboration Initiator modules at the CMWs of the chosen recipients, and sends a message causing the Collaboration Initiator modules to invoke the Snapshot Sharing modules 164 at each participant's CMW. Subsequent videoconferencing and data conferencing functionality is discussed in greater detail below in the context of particular usage scenarios. As indicated previously, additional collaborative services-such as Mail 165, Application Sharing 166, Computer-Integrated Telephony 167 and Computer Integrated Fax 168-are also available from the CMW by utilizing Collaboration Initiator module 161 to initiate the session (i.e., to contact the participants) and to invoke the appropriate application necessary to the collaborative session).

However, Ludwig does not teach listen string containing an application signature.

Mirashrafi et al., referring to figure.5, teaches audio /video conferencing application 502 support audio and video conferencing between remote locations, while data conferencing application 504 supports the sharing of data (e.g., documents) between the remote locations. In

Art Unit: 2757

general, conferencing system 100 is capable of simultaneously supporting multiple applications that support different types of conferencing services (e.g., audio/video conferencing, data sharing); comprising:

listing string containing an application signature (see col.21, lines 23-31, col.22, lines 31-34, col.23, lines 10-22);

launching intended recipient application using application signature (see col.19, lines 41-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention to combine the teaching of Ludwig, and Mirashrafi et al. to provide launching intended recipient application using application signature because the conferencing application launching only when there is an incoming call to handle.

5. In claim 2, Mirashrafi et al. teaches parsing incoming call signal to determine a signal type and a signal port; and determining intended recipient application based on signal type and signal port (see col.21, lines 23-60, col.22, lines 22 - 53).

6. In claim 3, Mirashrafi et al. teaches launching intended recipient application comprises the steps of: determining intended recipient application based on a signal type and a signal port (see col.21, lines 23-60, col.22, lines 22-53). Mirashrafi et al. teaches locating intended recipient application using application signature; and signaling a process manager to launching intended recipient application (see col.21, lines 23-60, col.22, lines 22-53, see col.23, lines 7-27).

Art Unit: 2757

7. In claim 4, Mirashrafi et al. teaches loading a call processing module into memory; and initializing call processing module to process calls using network interface (see col.19, lines 17-50).

8. In claim 5, Mirashrafi et al. teaches loading a call directing component; loading a first conference component; loading a first transport component; and loading a first network component (see col.19, lines 17-50, col.20, lines 1-51).

9. In claim 6, Mirashrafi et al. teaches initializing first network component to operate with network interface; initializing call directing component to monitor for incoming call signal; initializing first transport component to receive incoming call signal; initializing first conference component to transfer incoming call signal (see col.19, lines 17-50, col.20, lines 1-51).

10. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mirashrafi et al.(U.S.Patent No.5,574,934).

In claim 7, Mirashrafi et al. teaches receiving an initialization message from intended recipient application (see col.19, lines 17-50, col.20, lines 1-51).

However, Mirashrafi et al. does not teach removing intended recipient from an internal list if initialization message does not correspond to an expected message.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the combined system by removing intended recipient application from an internal list if initialization message does not correspond to an expected message because it is well known that if persistent listening is turned off for a listen string, there will be no notification of incoming calls for that

Art Unit: 2757

listen string if the conferencing applications that handles that listen string is not loaded and executing.

11. In claim 8, Mirashrafi et al. teaches a call directing module; a process manager coupled to call directing module; and a conferencing component coupled to network interface and call directing module where conferencing component containing a circuit for notifying call directing module upon receipt of an incoming call and causing call director to signal process manager to activate a conferencing application based on listen string and application signature (see col.19, lines 17-51, col.20, lines 1-50, col.21, lines 24-31).

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07 (a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136 (a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Serial Number: 08/646,503

Art Unit: 2757

Conclusion

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chuong Ho whose telephone number is (703)306-4529. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9am to 3pm.

14. If attempt to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the primary examiner, Dinh, Dunh, can be reached on (703)305-9655.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be direct to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

CH

Date 01-25-99



Dung C. Dinh
Primary Examiner